

FISCAL NOTE FOR NON-CAPITAL PROJECTS

Department:	Contact Person/Phone:	CBO Analyst/Phone:
Human Services Department	Sola Plumacher/733-9404	Jeanette Blankenship/615-0087

Legislation Title:

AN ORDINANCE related to the 2013 budget appropriation for the Human Services Department (HSD) Transitional Living and Support BCL; lifting a budget proviso to allow spending for outreach, engagement and case management services for families; and amending Ordinance 124058, which adopted the 2013 budget.

Summary of the Legislation:

This legislation lifts a budget proviso and authorizes the expenditure of \$135,000 from Human Services Department's Transitional Living and Support Budget Control Level in the 2013 Adopted Budget. This funding will be used for services to increase support and case management access for families. The legislation includes an attachment to the Fiscal Note with a Comprehensive Outreach and Engagement Strategy, as requested in the budget proviso.

Background:

The 2013-2014 Proposed Budget included \$135,000 to increase outreach, engagement and case management services for families. In adopting Green Sheet 103-1-A-2 in the 2013 Adopted Budget, the Council placed a proviso on the \$135,000 in funding for the Human Services Department with the intent that, prior to releasing the funding, the Executive submit to Council a Comprehensive Outreach and Engagement Strategy. The Strategy is included as an Attachment to this Fiscal Note.

X This legislation has financial implications.

Note: The 2013 Adopted Budget includes the funds that were held by proviso. No additional appropriations are required.

Anticipated Revenue/Reimbursement Resulting from this Legislation: N/A

Revenue/Reimbursement Notes:

Total Regular Positions Created, Modified, or Abrogated through this Legislation, Including FTE Impact:

N/A

Spending/Cash Flow:

N/A

Other Implications:

a) Does the legislation have indirect financial implications, or long-term implications?

The legislation will improve responsiveness to get families off the streets, potentially resulting in long-term savings.

b) What is the financial cost of not implementing the legislation?

Indirect costs related with family homelessness.

c) Does this legislation affect any departments besides the originating department?

No.

d) What are the possible alternatives to the legislation that could achieve the same or similar objectives?

None with existing resources, or fewer people would be served.

e) Is a public hearing required for this legislation?

No.

f) Is publication of notice with *The Daily Journal of Commerce* and/or *The Seattle Times* required for this legislation?

No.

g) Does this legislation affect a piece of property?

No.

h) Other Issues:

List attachments to the fiscal note below: